

Dec. 11, 2009 (#470)

# Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" LIVE on RBN:

Poem Copyright Alan Watt Dec. 11, 2009:

## U.N. -- Achieving Their Goal by Conquering Soul:

"Geopolitics Culminates in World Socialist Society,  
Run by Bureaucratic Levels of Every Variety,  
Rule by Terror and Fear, to go on Forever,  
Propaganda and Statistics used as Lever,  
War's Not to be Won, as Orwell said,  
But for Elite to Retain Power, Long After We're Dead,  
They'll Alter Your Genes, Capture Your Soul,  
Complete Dictatorial Power is their True Goal,  
The Dead will Adapt, as they have Down through History,  
Consumed with Pleasure and Trivia, Life's a Big Mystery,  
Never Knowing Huge Dramas are Part of the Plan  
To Conquer Free Spirit, the Right of Each Man"

© Alan Watt Dec. 11, 2009

Poem & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - Dec. 11, 2009 (Exempting Music,  
Literary Quotes, and Callers' Comments)

---

[cuttingthroughthematrix.com](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.com)

alternate sites:

[cuttingthroughthematrix.net](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.net) , [.us](http://.us) , [.ca](http://.ca)

[alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca](http://alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca)

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European  
languages for print up:

[alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://alanwattsentientsentinel.eu)

mirror site:

[cuttingthrough.jenknness.com](http://cuttingthrough.jenknness.com)

---

## Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and DONATIONS:

**Canada and America:** PayPal, Cash, personal checks &  
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, INTERNAL postal  
money orders

(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green  
internal one.)

**Outside the Americas:** PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram  
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars:  
mail via the postal services worldwide.)

**PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -**  
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

**Click the link below for your location (ordering info):**

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

---

Hi folks. I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on December 11<sup>th</sup>  
2009. I always suggest that newcomers to the show should look into

[cuttingthroughthematrix.com](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.com). That's my major web site. Scroll down, bookmark the other sites I have up there because once in a while the big ones freeze me up or cut me back and they can't find the problems and put me off for weeks on end sometimes, so this way, with the other sites up there and bookmarked, you can pull down the latest shows without a problem... I hope. I'll be going in to more of that tonight, as to the whys these things are actually happening. These are the ONLY authorized sites and you'll see [sites listed above].

As always, I keep reminding the audience at the start of the show - so as not to bore you throughout the show and I know everyone skips over this point - that you are the listeners; *you are the audience that brings me to you*. I'm not backed by any big foundation or NGO. I'm not selling lots and lots of products. I sell the books I've written and the disks I've made on my web site. I take donations as well. So it's up to you to keep me going. That way I'm pretty well independent. You can either buy the items that I have for sale by going in to the web site or you can donate. [Options listed above.] For those who want to send cash, it does get through. For those who get the disks burned and passed to them, of the shows, who don't like to use computers, they play them on their CD players, you can get write to me at [address above].

We really are brought up in a conditioned world. Everyone is conditioned. Your conditioning depends upon your geo-political status. An example of that is the British Commonwealth, as it's called. Canada, New Zealand, Australia and other countries are involved, even India, all come under that big umbrella. They all had the same agenda, the same path. It was decided in fact, when they formed the Royal Institute of International Affairs and even before that with the Milner Group - all the bankers in fact formed the Milner Group, international bankers - that they would use the British Empire as a NUCLEUS OF WORLD GOVERNMENT and on that foundation they brought in the League of Nations that became the United Nations. Therefore, they had the same goals, same strategies; sometime they would be ahead in one country than in another, it depends on how fast they can roll it forward but it always come down to the same laws, regulations and same direction of the global agenda in all the countries. That's so important because some of the topics I'm going to pick tonight have to do with this and how it works, the big picture. Back with more after this break.

Hi folks. I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix. I mentioned before the break how the whole idea of bringing the world together under a global system, in a FABIAN fashion - that means step by step, INCREMENTALISM THROUGHOUT GENERATIONS of people - until they reach their final goal. That was really the tract they chose to work on but they used geo-politics.

Lord Halford, a big player in all of that, is the man who really is given the credit for coming up with the whole science of geo-politics, how to work it into action, how to work it into actual fact and bring things about by PRE-PLANNING ON A GLOBAL SCALE. Of course, we find big players today like Brzezinski, Kissinger - who've been around forever, they seem immortal - are still playing the field and churning out their books on behalf of the agenda, the same agenda; it's never, ever changed direction. But in the British Commonwealth countries where that was to be the nucleus of a form of world order, the very high elite - very high indeed - created other branches that could not connect it obviously with the names of 'Royal' in them, especially in the US, so they called it the Council on

## Foreign Relations and IT'S THE SAME GROUP.

We find if we look at certain countries in the world today, Australia is leading the charge in so many of the socialist doctrines that Britain, strangely enough, hasn't quite caught up with. They've gone further in other areas in Britain, while Australia has gone further ahead with the same social doctrine, in particular areas, where they knew they would get away with it quicker. CENSORING THE INTERNET was one of them. Australia, and the whole world is to go this way, by the way, and it IS going this way. Australia, being part of the British Commonwealth, introduced a form of power that they could pull any web site and anyone who looked in to those web sites would also be charged, if you LOOKED at the particular web sites that were blacklisted. They can pull them and fine people thousands and thousands of dollars for being basically POLITICALLY INCORRECT.

China, and we've had the reports from Yahoo how they've not just cooperated with China. They want to keep the people there insular and still give most of the propaganda FROM the government TO the Chinese people; they don't want them going outside and elsewhere. Some of them still have access to external sites. What they do in those countries is what they do in Australia and in the British Commonwealth countries that are ALREADY DOING THIS. I know because it's done to me. They do exactly the same as they did in China. They give you hassles with your site, as I've had many times with Yahoo even though I'm on unlimited upload. They bring me to a stage and it's supposed to go up automatically and it doesn't. So they just stop it where it is until I contact them and say I can't upload anything. They still take the money, mind you, but they spend about 2 to 3 weeks to try to find out what the problem is. That's what you are told. These are called hassles. It's meant to make you throw your hands up in despair eventually as you go around in circles phoning them up and going around in more circles after you do phone them up, until you just give up. That's the idea.

They also do what they do in China and Australia. They actually TELL the internet service providers to technically, either just disable you or give you very slow speed. That's the reason that I'm getting very slow speed now from XplorNet. They've cut me down so many times from the higher speed I'm paying for until I get less than the lower speed that I'm not paying for, much, much less and double my upload time until, again, you're supposed to throw your hands up in despair and say well, I've had enough. That's what they hope. Same technique is in China, Australia and Canada... if you're on the blacklist. In other words, you are not AUTHORIZED to be out there *guiding the people*. They get you in a thousand ways. That's the real world.

This article falls right in line with this and it's from Francis Davey, who is a lawyer who offers legal advice to technology and media firms in computer and internet law.

### **Government wants new powers to block wikileaks and squeeze web tv**

Thursday, 10 December 2009 / Francis Davey

Just over a week ago I wrote a fairly dry legal analysis of the Digital Economy Bill. (*Alan: This is what they're calling it in Britain. They use different names*

in the Commonwealth depending on the country. It's all the same thing.) I spotted an extremely serious provision — clause 11 — in the version being discussed in the House of Lords. Having looked at the amendments (which you can find on the Bill's document page) (A: *He gives you all the links to all these on this page. I'll put up this particular site on my show at the end of the night for you to look at.*) I am worried that no-one in Parliament appears to be taking the problem serious.

What is the problem with clause 11 that I am getting so alarmed about it? It amends the Communications Act 2003 to insert a new section 124H which would, if passed (A: *Which it will.*), give sweeping powers to the Secretary of State. It begins:

(1) The Secretary of State may at any time by order impose a **technical** obligation on internet service providers if the Secretary of State considers it appropriate in view of— (A: *Then it just trails off into other things there.*)

Pausing there. Note that this says nothing at all about copyright infringement. For example the power could be used to: (A: *And it will be.*)

- order ISP's **to block any web page** found on the Internet Watch Foundation's list (A: *That's the same as Australia.*)
- block specific **undesireable sites** (such as wikileaks) (A: *And yours truly.*)
- block **specific kinds of traffic or protocols**, such as any form of peer-to-peer
- **throttle the bandwidth** for particular kinds of service or to or from particular websites.

(A: *In other words, here you are paying for high speed; I can't even download my own audio, as I'm talking here right now, on what they've cut me back to. So you see, they are ACTUALLY DOING IT, in Canada. So XplorNet is cooperating with them obviously to do this and XplorNet gives you an incredible run around when you ask them what's going on. So anybody who's thinking of trying to get a higher speed, forget XplorNet. I'll keep at XplorNet until they put my speed up to what I'm paying for. They have no problems taking the money.*)

In short, pretty much anything.

I do not exaggerate. The definition of a "technical obligation" and "technical measure" are inserted by clause 10:

A "technical obligation", in relation to an internet service provider, is an obligation for the provider to take **a technical measure against particular subscribers to its service.**

A "technical measure" is a measure that— (a) limits the speed or other capacity of the service provided to a subscriber; (b) prevents a subscriber from using the service to gain access to particular material, or limits such use; (c) suspends the service provided to a subscriber; or (d) limits the service provided to a subscriber in another way.

As you can see blocking wikileaks is simply a matter of applying a technical measure against all subscribers of any ISP.

Surely something must limit this power you ask? It seems not. The Secretary of State may make an order if "he considers it appropriate" in view of:

- (a) an assessment carried out or steps taken by OFCOM under section 124G; or (b) **any other consideration**. (*A: That's wide open, eh?*)

Where "any other consideration" could be anything. To their credit the Tories (*A: That's the conservatives.*) do seem to have realised that this particular alternative is overly permissive. Lord Howard of Rising and Lord de Mauley have proposed (in the first tranche of amendments proposed that the "or" be replaced by an "and".

What astonishes me is that there is no obligation for the Secretary of State to even publish such an order, let alone subject it to the scrutiny of Parliament, yet he could fundamentally change the way the internet operates using it. Other orders made under other parts of the Bill will have to be made by statutory instrument and most will require Parliamentary approval. Not this one.

...the one to use TECHNICAL METHODS of slowing your speed and so on is allowed to go ahead. The old boys' network, the old school tie, the Upper Canada College: 'Oh Berty, this guy is giving us a problem; give him a hassle will you and cut his speed.' 'What will we do if he calls up and complains?' 'Oh tell him it's probably his end and to get his satellite checked' like they did the last time. You get fed up of running out of money. That's what they do. That's what they really do folks, in the real world. That's how it's done. Freedom eh? Freedom of the internet. Here are the same techniques that they use in China to be used in Britain and it is being used already. It's being used in Canada already too. I know because I'm actually the object of one of their little circuses. Quite something. Quite something indeed.

Andrew Breitbart has a good site up there. This particular article is what's happened at the Climategate fiasco in Copenhagen. They're turning the armed guards on anybody who asks questions there about Climategate. I'm not kidding you.

## **UN Security Stops Journalist's Questions about Climategate**

- <http://biggovernment.com> - Posted By Mike Flynn On December 11, 2009

A Stanford Professor has used United Nation security officers to silence a journalist asking him "inconvenient questions" during a press briefing at the climate change conference in Copenhagen.

Professor Stephen Schneider's assistant requested armed UN security officers who held film maker Phelim McAleer, ordered him to stop filming and prevented further questioning after the press conference where the Stanford academic was launching a book. (*A: This is where all these big boys for the IPCC go and they're all given massive grants and then they get the ghost-*

written books. They get their lovely face on it and it's put out there for the public, for all the people that want to gobble that stuff up, the true believers.)

McAleer, a veteran journalist and film maker, has recently made a documentary "Not Evil Just Wrong" which takes a sceptical look at the science and politics behind Global Warming concerns. (A: *Oh, what an evil guy to do that. Back with more after this break.*)

Hi folks. This is Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix, talking about an incident that happened - probably one of many, no doubt - at the United Nations when a journalist that was actually put under armed guard basically for asking questions about Climategate to one of the head guys at the IPCC. That's the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate confabulation.

McAleer, a veteran journalist and film maker, has recently made a documentary "Not Evil Just Wrong" which takes a sceptical look at the science and politics behind Global Warming concerns.

He asked Professor Schneider about his opinions on Climategate - where leaked emails have revealed that a senior British professor deleted data and encouraged colleagues to do likewise if it contradicted **their belief** in Global Warming. (A: *Very well phrased, belief, because it's a belief system.*)

Professor Phil Jones, the head of Britain's Climate Research Unit, has temporarily stood down pending an investigation into the scandal. (A: *The independent inquiry, by the way, is led by a guy from the Royal Society who's an absolute... he's ardently supportive of the theory of global warming. So much for independent inquiries.*)

Professor Schneider, who is a senior member of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (A: *On all this hullabaloo of Climate Change.*), said he would not comment on emails that may have been incomplete or edited.

During some testy exchanges with McAleer, UN officials and Professor Schneider's assistants twice tried to cut short McAleer's question.

However as the press conference drew to a close Professor Schneider's assistant called armed UN security guards to the room. They held McAleer and aggressively ordered cameraman Ian Foster to stop filming. The guard threatened to take away the camera and expel the film crew from the conference if they did not obey his instructions to stop filming Professor Schneider.

The guard demanded to look at the film crews press credentials and refused to allow them to film until Professor Schneider left the room.

McAleer said he was disappointed by Professor Schneider's behaviour. (A: *Disappointed... I'd say more than that.*)

"It was a press conference. Climategate is a major story - it goes to the heart of the Global Warming debate by calling into question the scientific data and

the integrity of many scientists involved.”

“These questions should be answered. The attempts by UN officials and Professor Schneider’s assistant to remove my microphone were hamfisted but events took a more sinister turn when they called an armed UN security officer to silence a journalist.”

Well you see, if folk don’t get it through their heads – I think it’s way past the point of it actually, at the point of no return – that YOU ARE UNDER A FORM OF SOCIAL TYRANNY. It has many names to it, Communism, Socialism, whatever, it’s all the SAME. It’s ALL the same. Each branch of the whole communistic/socialistic agenda, the Fabian agenda, were all specialized branches to bring them all to the SAME ENDING and you are seeing it. The UN was set up NOT to be a democratic institution but a GOVERNING BODY, a world governing body. Here they are, turning armed guards on journalists who ask inconvenient questions. It was really built up to be a rah-rah, cheerleading party for all the IN crowd and all the NGOs that are getting paid to go there. They don’t want someone dampening their fire, so to speak.

There are so many stories to pick from to reaffirm the fact you are already under tyranny. You’re in a PLANNED society. I was going to talk about the NEW laws that are coming in to do with changing the way that we deal with the elderly and hospital care, under eugenics. They call it BIOETHICS. They used to be called The Eugenics Societies, now they call them Bioethics Committees. It sounds better because they used to get associated with Adolf Hitler and the eugenical policies and racial purity laws of the 1930s and 40s. They changed their name but they’re still running the show. You think that they’re fascist right-wingers but they’re not really. They belong to another group all together.

Professor Carroll Quigley knew darned well who they were because he worked for them. He said they are often mistaken for the far-left communist crew but he says it’s the Royal Institute of International Affairs, a worldwide organization. India’s got a big branch of them; EVERY country has got a big branch of them. In countries that don’t like the word Royalty, they call themselves the Councils on Foreign Relations. They’re really at the end of this major part of the 100 years war, as they planned it to be, from the early 1900s right up to the present time and then into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The 21<sup>st</sup> century was to be marked for change when the old form of communism - which was the fast way to socialism - was going to merge with the West. During that period, they would be *already socializing* the West through EDUCATION and SCIENTIFIC INDOCTRINATION AT SCHOOL and through the CULTURE INDUSTRY and all of the MEDIA. That has been done successfully.

So you are seeing the rise of the WORLD SOCIETY but it’s to go under the auspices of the United Nations, as I say, an UNdemocratic body. This is what they mean by GOVERNANCE, governance as opposed to government. Governance is a sort of vague term to some. It’s no national country. In fact, the enemy of this whole world society is nationalism and independent sovereignty AND the INDIVIDUAL, by the way. They say that the individual is a danger to world peace. You must be PART OF THE COLLECTIVE. That’s why we’re going through the BEGINNINGS of Orwell’s **1984** and have been since 2001 and we’ll merge eventually, in the next 30 years, into **Brave New World** of Huxley. That’s how it’s

designed to go. Back with more after this break.

Hi folks. This is Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix. I've said many times before that whenever you see the same kind of topics popping up all over the place, in different countries, at the same time, you know you're watching a concerted effort to get a message across. Nothing happens by chance in this world, especially when you take thousands and thousands and thousands of newspapers and different means of media, when they all converge on different topics suddenly at that same time, you know it's a coordinated effort.

Yesterday I mentioned the fact that a whole conglomeration of newspaper chains - including the Guardian in Britain, I think the Irish Times as well - and a whole bunch of them had got together and funded the advertising around Copenhagen to TELL all the people who were attending to pass the treaty, to sign it and pass it. Now that tells you number one, newspapers all have POLITICAL agendas. SO WHENEVER YOU'RE READING ANY ARTICLE AT ALL, REMEMBER THAT. They are not there to tell you the truth. In fact, I read a report not so long ago, it came from a trial I think, in the UK, maybe it was the US, to do with Fox, I think it was where journalists had taken their company to task because they were FORBIDDEN to write about a certain topic. It turned out that their own company had lied about the same topic in the past. It came out and the judge said newspapers are *NOT OBLIGATED TO TELL THE PUBLIC ANY TRUTH*. You see how we take it for granted that they're an appendage to our brain; they're telling us what we should know. No. They are PROGRAMMING you with particular political agendas and slants. You don't have to just slant a story, you can simply OMIT another part of it, a big chunk of it, to give you the impression and the conclusion THEY want you to arrive at.

Here's an article and I read yesterday about HOW they were touting up China as the model state for the world with its one child per family policy and how we should all emulate them. Now John Holdren remember, in that book that he co-authored in 1970s where he advocated sterilizing lots of people, millions of them, and finding ways for mandatory abortions and all the rest of it, where the government would decree that you were not allowed to have that child so they would abort it; this great guy that's now the science advisor for Obama. We should all be terrified because these RIGHT PEOPLE, the *right* people now, have been put in at the RIGHT TIME for their agenda, across the world... because they do go by planks and time tables, 5-year plans for this, 10 for that, and 50 years for that, 100 years to get to that stage. They know exactly what they're doing.

This is from Diane Francis who's been around forever in Canada. In Canada you don't have many main writers - same as actors and even TV stations - to make sure that they can always CONTROL all media and whatever the public are being told. It's all under the same control; it's much easier to control it that way. Kind of like the BBC did in Britain for years and years. This is from the FinancialPost.com. Here she is, rah-rahing. I've no doubt she's been told, 'now it's time for you to say your piece and repeat what we say'; that's how it's done.

## **The real inconvenient truth**

### **The whole world needs to adopt China's one-child policy**

Tuesday, December 8, 2009 / Presented by Diane Francis, Financial Post



(A: *There is a picture there of the Chinese all on bicycles in China, and a child's face behind them on a poster. I love how they use all these little psychological imprints on you.*)

The "inconvenient truth" overhanging the UN's Copenhagen conference is not that the climate is warming or cooling, but that humans are overpopulating the world. (A: *Here's your impartial person who brings you the news, right?*)

A planetary law, (A: *That's exactly what John Holdren said.*) such as China's one-child policy, is the only way to reverse the disastrous global birthrate currently, which is one million births every four days. (A: *So they say.*)

The world's other species, vegetation, resources, oceans, arable land, water supplies and atmosphere are being destroyed and pushed out of existence as a result of humanity's soaring reproduction rate.

Ironically, China, despite its dirty coal plants, is the world's leader in terms of fashioning policy to combat environmental degradation, thanks to its one-child-only edict.

...which is an utter lie because I've read from the China news before. Only about a month ago, two months ago or so - it's in the archives of my web site - where if you're *wealthy* you can have more than one child, you just have to pay a little fee and you pay a fee for each one. Which means that, eugenically speaking, the ones who should get up there by Darwin's standards, the ones who are more 'economically viable' are breeding the *right* children, having more of the *right* children, rather than have all the workers at the bottom out-breeding the ones at the top, exactly what Charles Galton Darwin said in his book in the 1950s called **The Next Million Years**. So here she is, rah-rahing China and how we should all copy China. Remember, it's the model that we've all to copy, or the state we've all to copy. They call it the MODEL state for the world, at the United Nations. Well, no thank you. No thank you. I don't want to copy anybody. How about you out there? Shouldn't it be up to the person what they want to do?

Government is a TYRANNY now. That's what it is. It's a complete, utter tyranny. It IS the combination of a long laid out plan and war that is comprised of different elements for different places, geo-politically used and different strategies. For the Soviet system it was a fast revolution to bring them up to speed. They'd been left as a socialized country regardless with the same system of education throughout; the fastest way to do it. In the West they use Fabian techniques, mainly through the British Empire to start with and the United States which was much, much slower because the US actually believed they had rights and freedoms on an individual basis. *To be honest with you, it's getting harder to find people in the US who are willing to do anything about standing up for those values.* The US was HEAVILY targeted, HEAVILY TARGETED by propaganda and infiltration quite a long time ago in fact, who have gotten up to the top very, very quickly because of the cash, financing and the right contacts to put them in the right positions, like Mr Holdren for instance.

So here she is. Here is Diane Francis advocating... again, pulling figures out of the air, as they love to do, just like the Climategate stuff. They would just pull figures and stats out of the air or feed the right kind of data into a computer that

you knew darn well was going to give you what you want to hear. But it must be true, because it's science... that's the argument. It must be true, that computer can't lie. Ha! A computer can only churn out what's fed into it... it depends on WHO is doing the feeding.

This article here, there's some good in it and some truth in it too. They obviously don't know the whole picture but it's from the Vancouver Sun.

## **If you've done nothing wrong, you have everything to worry about**

By Pete McMartin, Vancouver Sun November 21, 2009

Whenever someone frets about the erosion of personal freedoms in our modern society, such as in the steady proliferation of surveillance cameras in public places, the stock answer, which is one I read all too often in my e-mail, is:

"If you haven't done anything wrong, you have nothing to worry about."

People who say this are fools, not to be too blunt about it. Not only are they willing to trade away my rights, since they haven't a basic appreciation of theirs, but their understanding of the relationship between government and the governed is one of **subservience based on fear**, and the idea that their fear is not only natural, but justifiably **permanent** given the state of the world. (A: *That's what we've all been taught since 2001.*)

Thus, we should all be fearful, all of the time. We should empower government to do whatever it feels necessary to protect us. (A: *This is sarcasm obviously.*) The unquestioning nature of this logic not only institutionalizes fear, it makes it a patriotic duty. And the good citizen, the one who has done nothing wrong, will have nothing to worry about.

Oh, yeah?

Out of Britain comes the case recently of 40-year-old Jenny Paton, mother of three and, in the eyes of the state, a security hazard. Her crime? She was suspected of falsifying her address to enroll her daughter in a neighbouring school. (A: *That's been on TV in Britain. You wouldn't believe the lengths the government went to, to try and catch this woman. They tapped her phones. They had spies photographing her every move, following her everywhere... and nothing went through any particular government policy, agency or anything else.*)

A covert surveillance operation was begun on her in 2008, when -- and I am not making this up -- an officer from the local education department followed her for three weeks. He noted her movements in a log. The department obtained her telephone records.

Paton had done nothing wrong. And the local council where Paton lives maintained it had nothing wrong, either. Under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act of 2000, local governments have the power to use surveillance to investigate such picayune matters as reports of people not

cleaning up after their dogs, or whose dogs bark too loudly, of people who don't recycle (*A: If you don't recycle your trash, they'll put agents on you to watch you, monitor you, and tap your phone and everything else.*) or who put out their trash early, of people who operate unlicensed taxicabs. Some 474 local governments and 318 agencies have availed themselves of these powers (including, hilariously, the Charity Commission), and they can, and do, use hidden cameras, examine phone records, track website visits and hire people to go undercover. (*A ...to watch and follow you. It's astonishing. This woman, by the way, was just trying to get her child into a particular school. The whole thing was about what area she came under, under this socialized system that people think is just communist.*)

That's what we're under now is hundreds and hundreds of AGENCIES. THAT'S the beautiful brave new world they're bringing in. Agency after agency after agency, and there's no debating with them and when they come to your home too and say 'you can't burn a wood stove anymore, it's giving off carbon, we'll have to fine you \$10,000 a day until you stop doing it.' You'll say 'well, so what are you telling me, I've got to freeze to death?' They'll say 'oh no, we're not saying that sir, you can use electricity or some other method.' You say, 'I can't afford electricity or some other method.' 'Well, that's not our fault sir.' So you go back to the circle again, the circular argument, and you're condemned to death by freezing, 'Oh, no sir, you can use electricity'... round and round and round. That is it kids; that's how it really works.

This is the frustration that folk had in communist countries. The taxi cabs in Moscow at one point had to literally jack up the backs of their cars and turn back the odometers - for the mileage - in order to get their monthly ration of gasoline... or Moscow would have come to a standstill. That's how crazy it gets when you are under a completely SOCIALIZED system run by layer upon layer upon layer of bureaucrats. Welcome, because that's what global governance is all about and you're just on the verge of seeing it all implemented.

There's an article here from the Council on Foreign Relations from their magazine Foreign Affairs. As you know, they always tell you what the future is going to be because they are the guys who WORK IT INTO BEING on behalf of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Everybody knows - everybody that listens to this show and other shows on alternate news radio - will know that Brzezinski has basically said that Obama is his boy and Obama said that Brzezinski was his mentor. This is an article by Brzezinski. I'll put these links up on my website - if I can possibly get any speed up at all to upload it through XplorNet that's cut me back by their new policies, on behalf of the Canadian government - at the end of the show.

## **From Hope to Audacity**

### **Appraising Obama's Foreign Policy**

Published on Foreign Affairs (<http://www.foreignaffairs.com>)

Summary -- Barack Obama's foreign policy has generated more expectations than strategic breakthroughs. Three urgent issues -- the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Iran's nuclear ambitions, and the Afghan-Pakistani challenge -- will test his ability to significantly change U.S. policy.

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI was U.S. National Security Adviser from 1977 to 1981. His most recent book is *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower*.

*(A: I've already given the link out before where you hear Brzezinski in the 70s getting the jihad STARTED in Afghanistan when they were fighting the Soviets. He says on the video, tells the Afghanistans that theirs would be a HOLY WAR. The US created them, financed them through the CIA and once they'd been fighting at the Soviets – and the Soviets now are blended with the West under the new socialist world system – they have to get rid of them now. So the same guy is still making national policy. He also boasted, by the way, that he had a lot to do with the different 'soft power' revolutions like the Orange one in Czechoslovakia. They FUND the NGOs to go in. Same thing in Iran, when they were protesting in the street, he sort of smirked when he said that he also had a hand in that. They never stop, these guys. So he says here...)*

The foreign policy of U.S. President Barack Obama can be assessed most usefully in two parts: first, his goals and decision-making system (*A: Which is simply what he's been told to do.*) and, second, his policies and their implementation. Although one can speak with some confidence about the former, the latter is still an unfolding process.

To his credit, Obama has undertaken a truly ambitious effort to redefine the United States' view of the world and to reconnect the United States with the emerging historical context of the twenty-first century. He has done this remarkably well. In less than a year, he has comprehensively reconceptualized U.S. foreign policy with respect to several centrally important geopolitical issues:

- Islam is not an enemy, and the "global war on terror" does not define the United States' current role in the world; (*A: Which is a lie because they have to eradicate Islam, the actual religion itself.*)
- the United States will be a fair-minded and assertive mediator when it comes to attaining lasting peace between Israel and Palestine; (*A: That's another joke.*)
- the United States ought to pursue serious negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program, as well as other issues; (*A: Like getting their oil from them.*)
- the counterinsurgency campaign in the Taliban-controlled parts of Afghanistan should be part of a larger political undertaking, rather than a predominantly military one;
- the United States should respect Latin America's cultural and historical sensitivities and expand its contacts with Cuba;

It's amazing; these guys at one point can have the CIA in there training at the School of America and how to slaughter them all down in South America when it suited them, until they got all that in the bag and the RIGHT people in place. Then of course, they come back and say we must go to a different track now with Latin America, now that we've done all that we were successful in doing. See, there's no conscience with these psychopaths. Do you understand that? To them, everything is just like a maze they have to work through, a chess board, and they

do it instinctively. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS SHAME OR REGRET ON ANYTHING. And they enjoy what they're doing; they get a real kick on the power... of watching wars break out or revolutions break out where they've really agitated. They sit back and watch TV. They must have orgasms when they see the people being conned and fooled into carrying out policies they don't even understand because they don't know who's pulling the strings. Back after this break.

Hi folks. This is Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix, and jumping from the CFR and Brzezinski and all his pabulum to this other site here. It's from parentdish.co.uk and education news. It says...

## **Police ask nursery staff to monitor children for signs of Islamic radicalisation**

by Jennifer Laville Dec 11th 2009 / parentdish.co.uk

Counter terrorism police have turned their attention to pre-school tots (*A: No kidding. This is not a cartoon I'm reading from.*) in their attempts to stamp out fundamentalism. (*A: So they've asked nursery staff to monitor children for signs of Islamic radicalization. Why just Islamic? Why shouldn't it be across the board in that great democracy, for every single group? Hmm? 'Some are more equal than others in such utopias.' eh? That's what Orwell said.*)

A leaked e-mail sent by a terrorism officer from the West Midlands to community groups suggests that the police see very young children as posing a real potential threat.

The unnamed officer writes, "I do hope that you will tell me about persons, of whatever age, you think may have been radicalised or be vulnerable to radicalisation ... Evidence suggests that radicalisation can take place from the age of 4." (*A: So I guess they've done their little psychological studies.*)

The policy was derided last night by opposition parties with Chris Huhne, the Liberal Democrat home affairs spokesman, branding it an "absurd waste of police time".

Police spokesmen also seem to be trying to distance themselves from the leaked memo, with Sir Norman Bettison from the Association of Chief Police Officers describing it as a "clumsy" attempt to explain policy. (*A: Interesting too. See, you have an international police chiefs association that belongs to the United Nations, across the world, in Britain, the US and everywhere else. They even have their own TV station.*)

He added, "There is absolutely no example, nationally, of the police engaging with nursery-age kids specifically on this issue. That is the age for learning about 'Stranger Danger' and 'The Tufty Club'."

Arun Kundnani, of the Institute of Race Relations spoke to the officer who wrote the email. "He did seem to think it was standard. He said it wasn't just him or his unit that was doing it." (*A: That's requesting then to give the children they've taught the third degree.*)

"He said the indicators were they [children] might draw pictures of bombs (A: *Ha, ha. They're playing with video games all the time eh?*) and say things like 'all Christians are bad' (A: *Why would they say Christians?*) or that they believe in an Islamic state." (A: *does he mean the world state or just state? What is he talking about here?*)

The idea of monitoring very young children for warning signs of fundamentalism will seem Orwellian, intrusive or even pointless to many parents who are well aware of the bizarre things a four-year-old is capable of coming out with.

However, these concerns arise from genuine incidences, such as the convicted terrorist who was caught on camera indoctrinating his five-year-old son. He asked him "Who do you love?", until the boy replied "I love Sheikh Osama bin Laden," (A: *Well, what if you say I love Obama? Hmm? Or Jehovah? Or whatever?*)

Whilst most would agree that they want the country to be safe from the threat of terrorism, whether we are happy to let police officers (A: *Or the Pope for that matter, there's another one. Hmm?*) into nurseries to monitor our children in the name of national security is another question.

Then it goes into all the hoopla that the people in Parliament spoke about in their ever-ongoing pabulum... in this farce of a world, of a tyranny, this tyrannical world state that's emerged and people don't even know it outside of places like this show.

From Hamish and myself in Ontario, Canada where we've got lots of snow, thanks to the global warming, it's good night and may your God or your Gods GO with you.

## **Topics of show covered in following links:**

### [U.K. Government- Bill to Order Internet Providers to Block or Slow Speed of Blacklisted Sites](#)

("Government wants new powers to block wikileaks and squeeze web tv" (francisdavey.co.uk) - Dec. 10, 2009.)

### [Armed Guards Set on Journalist Who Asked About Climategate-Copenhagen](#)

("UN Security Stops Journalist's Questions About ClimateGate" by Mike Flynn (biggovernment.com) - Dec. 11, 2009.)

### [Financial Post, Canada-Calls for Global China-Style One Child per Family Law](#)

(Diane Francis: "The whole world needs to adopt China's one-child policy" (financialpost.com) - Dec. 8, 2009.)

### [Britain-More Orwellian than Orwell Foresaw](#)

("If you've done nothing wrong, you have everything to worry about" by Pete McMartin - Nov. 21, 2009.)

(Article at original link was removed. Link is to excerpt in transcript text.)

[Brzezinski Praises his man Obama](#)

("From Hope to Audacity: Appraising Obama's Foreign Policy" by Zbigniew Brzezinski (foreignaffairs.com) - Dec. 11, 2009.)

[Video: "Zbigniew Brzezinski to Jihadists: Your cause is right!" \(youtube.com\).](#)

[Nurseries Monitor for Signs of "Radical" Islamist Indoctrination](#)

("Police ask nursery staff to monitor children for signs of Islamic radicalisation" by Jennifer Laville (parentdish.co.uk) - Dec. 11, 2009.)

Transcribed by Diana

---

**Alan's Materials Available for Purchase and Ordering Information:**

- |                              |   |   |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| <a href="#"><u>BOOKS</u></a> | "Cutting Through" & "Waiting for the Miracle....."<br>Volumes 1, 2, 3           | Also available in Spanish or Portuguese translation:<br>"Esperando el Milagro....." ( <a href="#"><u>Español</u></a> ) & "Esperando um Milagre....." ( <a href="#"><u>Português</u></a> ) |
| <a href="#"><u>CDs</u></a>   | Ancient Religions and History MP3 CDs:<br>Part 1 (1998) and Part 2 (1998-2000)  | & Blurbs and 'Cutting Through the Matrix' Shows on MP3 CDs (Up to 50 Hours per Disc)  |
| <a href="#"><u>DVDs</u></a>  | "Reality Check Part 1" & "Reality Check Part 2 - Wisdom, Esoterica and ...TIME" |   |